UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/771,684	01/30/2001	Jeffrey V. Cook	NAI1P071/00.101.01	8144

28875   7590   01/13/2005

Zilka-Kotab, PC
P.O. BOX 721120
SAN JOSE, CA 95172-1120

EXAMINER
DADA, BEEMNET W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2135	

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 10/21/04 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

<u>PERIOD FOR REPLY</u> [check either a) or b)]

a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

    (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

    (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);

    (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

    (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

    NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5. ☒ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: *See Continuation Sheet*.

6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)☒ will not be entered or b)☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

    The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

    Claim(s) allowed: _____.

    Claim(s) objected to: _____.

    Claim(s) rejected: *1-29*.

    Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the same reason as set forth in the previous office action, pages 2-7. Regarding claims 1, 17 and 18, Applicant argues that neither Moses (US Patent 6,442,688) nor Guski (US Patent 6,711,679) disclose contracting among tiers as to the type of changes to conditions of the electronic certificates. Applicant furhter argues Guski does not meet applicant's claimed framework wherein the compute systems in the tiers are logically organized as a "ring," "web," or "tree". The examiner respectfully disagrees. Moses teaches the system that includes a server, plurality of end user computers, a certification authority system, and a directory [column 3, lines 40-44, and figure 1], wherein the server system monitors changes to the electronic certificates and notifies users (end user computers) said changes [column 3, lines 6-14], and Guski teaches a public key infrastructure, where a plurality of computer system, that is logically divided into multiple tier network [column 6, lines 62-67, column 7, lines 1-8 and column 8, lines 9-20], including a computer system in one tier adapted for securely communicating certificate information to a computer system in a next tier [column 7, lines 9-20, column 8, lines 21-36]; whereby nodes in one tier utilize a mutually agreed key with nodes in the next tier [column 8, lines 40-47]. Moses could have been modified by Guski to arrive at the claimed invention by having the server, plurality of end user computers, certification authority system, and directory system, that are adapted for monitoring and notifying changes to certificates (see Moses column 3, lines 40-44, and figure 1) and logically dividing the system into a multiple tier system (note that computer system in tier based framework can be designed as tree, ring, web, bus, star, etc., based on design choice) including a computer system in one tier adapted for securely communicating certificate information to a computer system in a next tier as taught by Guski (see Guski column 7, lines 9-20, column 8, lines 21-36).

KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

2